

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 30, 2008. Claims 1 and 6 to 15 are in the application, with Claim 3 having been cancelled herein. Claims 1, 13 and 14 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 6 to 8 and 13 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0184004 (Shizuka) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,103,551 (King). Claims 9 to 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Shizuka in view of King and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,334,103 (Surace). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The claims of the present application generally concern processing button selections on an apparatus including an execution button, a third button and a help button. The help button is for setting a help mode as a state of the apparatus or for setting a normal mode by canceling the help mode. In the claims, the state of the apparatus is determined to be a normal mode or a help mode and it is also determined which of the help button, the execution button and the third button is selected.

According to one aspect, in a case that the state of the apparatus is the normal mode and the execution or the third button is selected, a motion corresponding to the selected button is executed. On the other hand, if the state of the apparatus is the help mode and the third button is selected, a description of a motion corresponding to the third button is phonetically output. In addition, the motion corresponding to the third button is stored in a storage device. In a case where the execution button is selected in the help mode, the motion stored in the storage device is executed.

By virtue of this arrangement, it is ordinarily possible for a user to hear audio descriptions of a selected button and to execute motions corresponding to the selected button after hearing its audio description, without leaving the help mode. Advantageously, this addresses problems found by the Applicants relative to conventional arrangements. For example, as described beginning at line 21 on page 2:

“First of all, a user feels a good sense of operability if the user can move on to execution of the desired input device immediately after the description of the operation content is presented. However, in the conventional data processing apparatus, the operation cannot be executed unless the user exits from the help mode. Therefore, in the conventional data processing apparatus, the user has to go back and forth between the help mode and the normal mode, deteriorating the good sense of operability of the data processing apparatus. In particular, this is more problematic for a case where the user is vision-impaired.”

The claimed arrangement addresses this issue with the conventional art, by providing a good sense of operability with respect to motion without necessarily leaving the help mode.

Referring specifically to the claim language, independent Claim 1 is directed to a control method for an apparatus that includes a help button, an execution button and a third button, wherein the help button is for setting a help mode or setting a normal mode by canceling the help mode as a state of the apparatus. The method includes a button determination step of determining which of the help button, the execution button and the third button is selected, and a setting step of setting the state of the apparatus in the help mode, in a case where it is determined in the state determination step that the state of the apparatus is the normal mode and it is determined in the button determination step that the help button is selected. The method also includes a first execution step of executing a motion corresponding to a button determined in the button determination step, in a case where it is determined in the state determination step that the state of the apparatus is the normal mode and it is determined in the button determination step that the execution button

or the third button is selected. In addition, the method includes a cancellation step of canceling the help mode of the apparatus, in a case where it is determined in the state determination step that the state of the apparatus is the help mode and it is determined in the button determination step that the help button is selected. The method further includes an output-storage step of phonetically outputting a description of a motion corresponding to the third button and storing the motion corresponding to the third button in a storage device, in a case where it is determined in the state determination step that the state of the apparatus is the help mode and it is determined in the button determination step that the third button is selected, and a second execution step of executing the motion stored in the storage device, in a case where it is determined in the state determination step that the state of the apparatus is the help mode and it is determined in the button determination step that the execution button is selected.

Independent Claims 13 and 14 are directed to an apparatus and a program, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of the present claims, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the features of phonetically outputting a description of a motion corresponding to a third button and storing the motion corresponding to the third button in a storage device, in a case where it is determined that a state of an apparatus is a help mode and it is determined that the third button is selected, and executing the motion stored in the storage device, in a case where it is determined that the state of the apparatus is the help mode and it is determined that the execution button is selected.

As understood by Applicants, Shizuka is directed to a system for setting different voice types for reading text data of an electronic mail. See Shizuka, Abstract.

Although Shizuka appears to disclose outputting speech data corresponding to text data, Shizuka does not output speech data that describes a motion corresponding to a button. The speech data output by Shizuka only corresponds to text data. Accordingly, Shizuka fails to disclose or suggest phonetically outputting a description of a motion corresponding to a third button.

Furthermore, although Shizuka appears to disclose outputting speech data corresponding to text data to an external recording apparatus or medium, Shizuka does not disclose or suggest storing a motion corresponding to a third button in a storage device. As a result, Shizuka cannot execute a motion stored in a storage device, in a case where it is determined that a state of the apparatus is a help mode and it is determined that an execution button is selected.

The Office Action alleges at page 2 that “Shizuka teaches a system that outputs voice based on voice types which has the option of displaying a guidance mode, wherein a help mode is selected”. Several figures in Shizuka disclose help buttons as part of various windows in a graphical user interface. See, e.g., Shizuka, Figure 24. However, the help buttons disclosed in Shizuka do not affect whether a description of a motion is phonetically output or whether a motion stored in a storage device is executed. Instead, the help buttons of Shizuka merely allow a user to display a help window to provide guidance as to how to use the system disclosed in Shizuka. See, e.g., Shizuka, paragraph [0240].

King is directed to a computer network in which a first computer system transmits screen image information of the first computer system to a second computer system. The first computer system also conveys a verbal description of the screen image to the second computer system. The second computer system may receive user input and transmit an input signal to the first computer system corresponding to the user input. In

response to the input signal, the first computer system updates the screen image. See King, Abstract. Although King appears to disclose outputting a verbal description of a screen image, King does not disclose or suggest phonetically outputting a description of a motion corresponding to a third button and storing the motion corresponding to the third button in a storage device, in a case where it is determined that a state of an apparatus is a help mode and it is determined that the third button is selected.

As with Shizuka, without storing a motion corresponding to a third button, King also cannot execute a motion stored in a storage device, in a case where it is determined that a state of an apparatus is a help mode and it is determined that an execution button is selected. For example, as described in column 7, lines 1 to 31 in reference to Figure 2 of King, an input provided from client 104A initiates a software program at server 102. As the operating system of server 102 initiates the software program, the screen image of client 104A is updated to reflect initiation of the software program and speech information is transmitted to client 104A from server 102 without storing a motion corresponding to the input. Accordingly, King does not disclose or suggest executing a motion stored in a storage device, in a case where it is determined that a state of the apparatus is a help mode and it is determined that an execution button is selected.

Therefore, Shizuka and King, alone or in combination, are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the features of phonetically outputting a description of a motion corresponding to a third button and storing the motion corresponding to the third button in a storage device, in a case where it is determined that a state of an apparatus is a help mode and it is determined that the third button is selected, and executing the motion stored in the

storage device, in a case where it is determined that the state of the apparatus is the help mode and it is determined that the execution button is selected.

Surace has been reviewed and is not seen to remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Shizuka and King.

Therefore, independent Claims 1, 13 and 14 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200